JAN 1 3 2009 33

I FWS

PTO/SB/21 (11-03) Approved for use through 12/31/2008. ONB 0651-0031
U.S. Petent and Tradianark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE ensurik Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are netwited to respond to a collection offinitum attien enters it displays a valid OHB control number. Application Number 10/583,520 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date First Named Inventor **FORM** Art Umit **Examiner Name** BERNSITIN (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number **Total Number of Pages in This Submission ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Petition Amendment/Reply (Appeal biotice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavils/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify **Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request** below/): Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s)\_ Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts umder 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Fam Name Signature Printed name unnen believe Date Reg. No. CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSIONAMAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Signature Dette CUNNIN GHAM Typed or printed name FRANK

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FRES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Fol \$65 US Pollage (
Plets & parson Handweine Computed Just Broke

JAN 1 3 2009 F1

Frank Cunningham 95 Kearsly Rd Crumps all Manchester M8 4QJ

Email – <u>Tcun95@aol.com</u> Tel (international code

UK) 0161 492 0715

**Application Number** 

10/583,520 App N°

F.A.C. COMMISSIONEL FOR PATENTS

Response to report of Daniel Bernstein Patent examiner United States Patent Office USA

Dear Sir / MADAM

This is my response to the report dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008.

Further to sur recent telephone conversation I would like to reply in detail to your TVE Fermion S report. I believe I can submit another description so long as it does not go beyond what was already sent and that I could also include drawings to help describe the invention better.

I would like to attach my response to the official report before the 18th November 2008 and it may be better if I fax this december to make this deadline and save \$65 dettarted a months extension.

Please let me know you have received this in time. I will try to respond to your report in a detailed way and in the same format as your report section by section to make it easier for me starting with paragraph 1 on your report at page 4

- 1. I agree with the examiner here I am not fully familiar with the procedures of the US patent office but I do have some experience with the UK patent office and will try my best to work through the process and if I do make some administrative errors please pardon my lack of experience.
- 2. I will space my other description double spaced and put a proper title to it

- 3. I will amend this claim and others detailed accordingly
- 4. I will amend the specification accordingly
- 5. I will attach drawings and work further on the specification to be more in line with the US patent office procedures
- 6. With great respect the other inventions that the examiner referred to are not the same as what is in the drawings and specification and could not have been so as self cleaning glass is a very recent development (see "pilkington" glass company UK) and it appears no one anywhere has thought to use this very specific glass especially in the manner I have stated in the specification and drawings.
- 7. I agree that some of what I have put can appear non-limiting but that was not my intention. I was trying to describe something that has not existed before and this is I am sure you would agree very difficult to do as there is no like for like or comparison to compare it with. The Carbon Trust based in the UK also understood the idea and quoted references that appeared to strongly favour the idea as original and showing great potential.
- 8. I can only say again that with respect I say that when this is seen in the drawings and further specification it is not anticipated and this is evidenced because I have been contacted by interested parties in the USA who wanted a percentage of the idea for help to get the invention to market. I ended up speaking to them on the phone and they understood the invention and agreed with me there appeared nothing like it anywhere. The interested parties also said the idea was very timely in light of the problems with oil shortages in the US and worldwide problems on energy demands. (I can also send details to prove this if you would like me to)
- 9. I believe I am allowed to file a further description and drawings as long as they do not go beyond what is already detailed would deal with the issue of obviousness as set out in this particular paragraph.
- 10. With respect to the examiner the prior art of Warrick and Malone according to the report was prior art that was around many years <u>before</u> (Malone was 1982 some 25yrs before) the advent of self cleaning glass which is a very recent development by Pilkinton glass company UK and therefore the prior art could not have anticipated what I have drawn and described in detail in the specification and this is further evidenced by the interest in my patent from a US company who said my idea was timely and

they noticed its potential. They do not want money but a percentage of the patent to help get the idea to market.

- 11. I agree that some prior art may appear on the face of it to teach a little of what I am talking about but this is minor and my patent appears to have significant inventive step over all that has gone before with the use of self cleaning glass in such a way that no one has ever described or drawn before.
- 12. This paragraph and up to paragraph 14 refers to procedures and help available from the US patent office. Please understand I do not wish anything from this patent other than to make a living as I am disabled and unemployed with my disability (lost leg in a car accident) making it more difficult for me to work especially in my previous profession as an automobile mechanical engineer. Innovation is the lifeblood of the US economy and I have many ideas like this one and better but cannot bring these forward until this matter is resolved.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to hearing from you regarding this response and amended claims, specification, and drawings

Best regards

Frank Cunningham